

**Virginia Land Conservation Foundation
Subcommittee
November 29, 2007
Dorey Recreational Center
Richmond, Virginia**

Subcommittee Members Present

R. Brian Ball, Chair
Alexandra Liddy Bourne
William C. Dickinson

Joseph H. Maroon, Director
Margaret H. Davis
Nicole M. Rovner

Subcommittee Members Not Present

Thomas B. Graham

DCR Staff Present

Jason Bulluck
Michael R. Fletcher
Jeremy Stone

David C. Dowling
Sarah Richardson

Others Present

James Adams, Department of Game and Inland Fisheries
Deb Van Duzee, Department of Game and Inland Fisheries
Rob Farrell, Virginia Department of Forestry
Elizabeth Tune, Department of Historic Resources

Call to Order

Mr. Ball called the meeting to order at 10:14 a.m. Mr. Ball said that the purpose of the subcommittee meeting was to review the suggested changes to the grants manual.

Mr. Maroon said that the hope was to get the subcommittee's endorsement of changes so that the recommended changes could be taken to the full Board. He said that it was possible that the work would not be completed at this session and that there might be a need for additional edits.

Mr. Maroon said that the subcommittee members had the draft version showing changes made from the last subcommittee meeting in October.

Ms. Richardson reviewed the draft changes to the draft manual. She explained that the editing marks in the draft were color-coded. Text in blue was added to the manual. Text in red was stricken. Areas highlighted in yellow were changes made since the last subcommittee meeting.

Ms. Richardson said that the first change to the draft was on page 16. She said that at the last subcommittee meeting the discussion had been about raising the profile of the Virginia Land Conservation Foundation.

She said that the consensus among staff revising the draft was that, rather than require applicants to submit letters of support, that letter would be encouraged.

Ms. Richardson said the next change was on Page 28 in the Open Space and Parks category. She said that titles were added to each of the criteria for ease of reading.

Ms. Richardson said that the first criterion that referred to protecting or acquiring greenways, blueways, viewsheds, abandoned rail corridors and open space areas was deleted because those are reflected elsewhere in the scoring.

She said that other scoring numbers had changed as the criteria had been reorganized. She noted that some items were shown as deleted, but were not actually removed, but placed in a different position.

Ms. Richardson said that the requirement for partnerships with public agencies, corporations and non-profit organizations was deleted at the direction of the subcommittee.

Ms. Richardson said that the item regarding adjacency to parks or conserved lands was moved from number 8 to number 2. She said that Mr. Bulluck from the Division of Natural Heritage was present to discuss this item.

Mr. Bulluck noted that the urban fringe model had been used.

Ms. Richardson said that Mr. Davy felt this model was the best way to determine what land was actually being developed.

Mr. Maroon said that the issue with the rapidly developing model was that it focused on rural areas and did not include cities that are already being developed.

Ms. Rovner asked why the focus was on overall population rather than density.

Ms. Richardson said that she did not have the density information available.

Mr. Dickinson said that to determine the density the population of the locality is divided by the acreage. He said that along with the lands needs assessment should determine the priorities. He said that, while the map shows areas that are developing, he wanted to make sure densely populated areas were included in the discussion.

Mr. Dickinson said that perhaps the term locality was not the right term.

Ms. Richardson said the question is whether both the model and the density issue should be considered together.

Mr. Ball said that, in order to get the issue before the full Board, the subcommittee could recommend changes subject to a revision of item number seven that includes areas that may have been inadvertently excluded. He suggested that Mr. Dickinson review the final language.

Mr. Dickinson said that he would like to compare this model to projects the Board had already reviewed to determine if there would be changes in the distribution.

Mr. Maroon said that he had asked staff to use the revised criteria with several project. He said that while there were some changes in the rankings over all he was pleased with the new rankings. He said that the top scorers would not likely have changed.

Mr. Maroon said that one purpose of looking at density was to look at the usability of the site. He said that density right around the project might not be what the Board wants to consider.

Mr. Dickinson said that he was referring to density in the general area. Specifically he was referring to parks to which the population has access.

Mr. Maroon suggested that the criteria be less defined and that the applicant be asked to demonstrate or justify the density, but not from a numeric standpoint.

Mr. Dickinson said there was a need for flexibility.

Ms. Rovner said that she thought density is an objective measure.

Ms. Bourn said that using the definition of a city or township would help address the problem. She said that if a political jurisdiction is already defined as a town or a city then it should fall into the requirements for Item #7.

Ms. Rovner noted that the exceptions might be cities like Virginia Beach and Chesapeake.

Mr. Ball suggested that this refer to separately incorporated cities.

Ms. Richardson suggested the language could be over 90,000 in population and/or a separately incorporated city.

Mr. Maroon suggested that the language read for those localities below a population of 90,000 that are designated as an incorporated city.

Mr. Ball asked if the subcommittee could approve that language.

Mr. Maroon said it might be helpful to get the full board consideration and then review this document one additional time.

Mr. Adams from DGIF said that it might be possible to adjust the model to capture the issue of concern.

Mr. Maroon said an overlay of the two models might accomplish that.

Mr. Bulluck said there could be another layer on the model to include boundaries.

Mr. Ball said that it appeared the subcommittee was ready to move forward with Ms. Bourne's suggestion. He said that the full Board could decide to move forward or whether additional edits were needed.

Mr. Maroon said areas outside densely populated areas and under a greater threat should also get consideration.

Ms. Richardson said that, in the Forestry category score sheet on Page 35, one of the main questions dealt with watersheds.

Mr. Farrell said that there had been confusion as to the scoring in the watershed category. He said that rather than just being in the watershed, if the property actually touches the body of water where the forest does the most buffering then that would be awarded a higher point value.

Ms. Richardson noted that in item three the language was changed to say that the landowner is willing to follow plan recommendations for forest management goals.

Mr. Farrell said that the concern was that previously the language referenced forest products.

Mr. Ball said that the revision would not favor the landowner for actively harvesting the land.

Ms. Richardson said that on Page 36 additional scoring was added for the ratio of the applicant match to the total project cost.

Ms. Bourne said that applicants should be rewarded for being willing to match the funds. She said that increases the value to the Commonwealth.

Ms. Richardson said that concluded the review of the revisions.

There being no further business, the subcommittee was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Brian Ball
Subcommittee Chair

Joseph H. Maroon
Director